

THE WORLD

Vol. XVI
No. 29

TOMORROW

That Fellowship Questionnaire

JOHN BENNETT

Letters From

Judge Panken

Elisabeth Gilman

A Century Before Hitler

EDWARD G. OLSEN

DECEMBER 21st

15 cents a copy, \$3.00 a year

**Making
Radicalism
Effective**

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

The World Tomorrow

Vol. XVI December 21 No. 29
Copyright, 1933

The World Tomorrow, Inc.

Published on alternate Thursdays at
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York,
N. Y.

CONTENTS

	Page
Editorials	675
Beyond Gold Tinkering. By Norman Thomas	680
Making Radicalism Effective. By Reinhold Niebuhr	682
Conscience and Federal Jurisdic- tion. By Edwin C. Johnson	684
Stern Words (<i>verse</i>). By E. Guy Talbot	685
Not in the Headlines	686
A Century Before Hitler. By Edward G. Olsen	687
Socialist Gains in Arizona. By J. Harvey Tremaine	689
That Fellowship Questionnaire. By John Bennett	690
Untangling Europe— <i>A Book Re- view</i> . By Maxwell S. Stewart	693
Two Modern Apostles Speak— <i>A Book Review</i> . By Frances Perry	693
Correspondence	694
The Last Word	695

THE WORLD TOMORROW is on file in most
public and college libraries and is indexed
in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Litera-
ture*.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Single Copies, 15
cents; \$3 per year; Canada, \$3.50; foreign,
\$3.50. Orders for copies, subscriptions and
all correspondence should be sent to THE
WORLD TOMORROW, 52 Vanderbilt
Ave., New York City. Entered as Second
Class Matter, Sept. 30, 1926, at the Post
Office of New York, under the act of March
3, 1879.

Ex Cathedra

BEING something of a determinist, I
am rather more interested in move-
ments than in men. Nevertheless,
the idiosyncrasies of human beings, their
hopes, fears and ambitions, their foibles
and their occasional displays of virtue and
courage are always interesting. For that
reason I pick the following items out of
the day's news:

(a) Alfred E. Smith's statement on the
currency problem, as an example of the
pathetic. It is so obviously dictated by
jealousy of a former disciple who has out-
stripped him; and the effort to make a
sentiment dictated by banking interests ap-
pear to be a courageous utterance, offered
in the interest of the nation, adds to the
pathos because it springs from such an evi-
dent self-deception.

(b) Franklin Roosevelt's artful concili-
ation of conflicts within his official family,
most recently in the agricultural admin-
istration. I know that Roosevelt is an
opportunist, with more tactical skill than
strategic resource. But that does not dim-
inish interest in and admiration for the
genius in handling men that he displays.
The skill with which he eased Moley out
of his job, the art with which he balances
Conservatives and left-wing Liberals in his
administration, and the subtlety with which
he tries to satisfy both the inflationists and
the advocates of a sound dollar are all
revelations of some kind of genius. It may
not be a type of genius that commands awe
or even admiration. But since the world
is full of flat-footed people, nimbleness
always possesses an attractiveness in its
own right.

(c) Rev. Daniel Poling's statement:
"We do not recognize in repeal the defeat
of our cause. Dry victories may be ex-
pected in local communities, in counties
and in states throughout the nation. There
is still natural dry territory and other
territory that may be won." Defenders of
lost causes are always pathetic. There was
a time when prohibition forces insisted
that local option was no solution for the
liquor problem and that only national pro-
hibition would give the prohibition experi-
ment real significance. Now these same

people are returning to the idea of local
option, when they ought to be busy de-
vising better forms of state-control.

CAPTAIN Ernst Roehm announces
that the Nazi Storm Troops, which
he heads, now number two and a half
million men, and that their chief purpose
is to prevent the outbreak of communism.
It seems rather strange that a government
which secured the affirmative vote of all
but two million of its citizens should need
an army of over two million to prevent a
revolution. Evidently Hitler doesn't take
his confidence vote as seriously as he wants
the outside world to take it.

MUSSOLINI wants to reform the
League of Nations, but England
and France declare themselves satisfied
with it "as is". What they really mean
is that they do not want to help Musso-
lini to any further prestige. They doubt-
less feel that the Italian dictator has al-
ready gained too much eminence from his
peculiar position as mediator between
Germany and the Allies. He has become
a kind of broker, doing business on both
sides.

I WOULD like to offer Samuel Unter-
meyer, the redoubtable champion of
the Jewish boycott, a word of advice. His
public pronouncements are so uniformly
extravagant and venomous that he detracts
from his cause. It may be rather cheap
for Gentiles to advise Jews to be calmer
in their day of crisis. Their provocations
are so great that the resentments which
they express are natural enough. Never-
theless, a certain loss of dignity is always
involved in obvious resentment. Mr. Un-
termeyer might profitably read the prophet
Isaiah, particularly those chapters attrib-
uted to the second Isaiah. There are re-
ligious and moral insights there which the
Jews may rightfully claim to be peculiar
to their racial spirituality and which are
not evident in the strident notes of Mr.
Untermeyer's protestations.

PRONUNCIO

THE WORLD TOMORROW

Editors

Kirby Page
Devere Allen
Reinhold Niebuhr

Norman Thomas, Founder and Special Contributor

Editorial Assistant

Marvin R. Bendiner

Circulation Manager

Willard R. Espy

President

John Nevila Sayre

Secretary

Dorothy Detzer

Associate Editors

H. N. Brallsford
George A. Coe
Halford E. Luccock
H. C. Engelbrecht

Editorial Secretary

Sophie Trefon

Office Secretary

Ethelred Brown

Treasurer

Henry P. Van Dusen

Contributing Editors

John Bennett
Paul H. Douglas
Sherwood Eddy
John Haynes Holmes
Samuel Guy Inman
Edward L. Israel
Paul Jones
A. Albert MacLeod

Patrick Murphy Mallin
Francis J. McConnell
Rhoda E. McCulloch
Helen Grace Murray
A. J. Muste
H. Richard Niebuhr
William Pickens
Maxwell S. Stewart

THE WORLD TOMORROW

Vol. XVI

December 21, 1933

No. 29

Christmas Realism

As one Christmas follows another in the barren stretch of depression years, there is made more and more painfully evident the futility of religious sentimentalism. If Christmas is not to be merely an ironic mockery in a world of hunger and cold, and of human destitution in the midst of plenty, it must partake more of the realism which is at the center of the Christian heritage. There has been a tragic short-circuiting of the impulses generated by the Christmas festival. Both the vicious sentimentalism which finds a premature satisfaction in emotion itself and the sentimentalism which is satisfied with the discussion of ends without the provision of means for reaching the ends have characterized to a great extent the observance of Christmas, and prevented it from becoming the force for social transformation which it should be and might be.

Christmas is the story of a baby. In that lies part of its eternal appeal. But in that fact also lies a danger. For multitudes of people make a sentimental response to the infant Christ and shrink from making a moral response to the man Jesus. They miss the chief point of the Christmas story, which is that the baby grew up into a Son of Man, who made a devastating challenge to a world of greed, of privilege, of hard power. To treat Christmas only as the story of a baby, to sing about it in time-honored carols, to paint it, to celebrate it, and fail to realize and accept the challenge which Jesus the man makes to our whole way of life, is vanity. For that old figure of medieval Christmas revels, The Lord of Misrule, still presides over most of our world. The only adequate celebration of Christmas in this world of 1933 is the endeavor to give to the love which "came down at Christmas," as the carols joyously proclaim, sufficient implementation in a changed social structure so that love may be built into the very fabric of our living together.

Sentimentalism in Christianity is particularly tragic when we think of the heritage of realism which rightly belongs to Christianity. Jesus had a truly terrifying realism. It is a sad irony to think of his name being joined in any manner to the shortsightedness of a chirping optimism, sustained by the blind or cowardly evasion of actual facts. How Jesus hated sentimentalism, emotionalism, blinders and screens! He knew what was in man. His eyes were moral X-rays, never confusing shadow with substance. An orthodox member of the Jewish church might well have complained that this prophet from Galilee was not striking a con-

structive optimistic note; that he was pessimistic. He was profoundly pessimistic about the issue of a way of life not founded on a rock, about man without God. Selling this birthright of the penetrating realism of Jesus for a mess of optimistic pottage is one of the tragedies of Christian history.

There is a deep suggestiveness in the new form of Christmas decoration which has become common in cities in recent years, that of a cross on the side of high buildings, formed by lighting certain offices to form the appropriate shape. It is the moving symbol of a great task, the hope of our world, that the church and the message of Jesus Christ must be in our world not merely like a little Christmas tree, a temporary addition in some city park. It is, rather, to be a part of business itself, of the things that we do for a living, of the texture of our daily life and the work of our whole industrial world.

That lighted cross is a symbol of the necessity for giving to love and social idealism the necessary tools of social control and ownership of the common wealth.

The Deeper Wisdom of Religion

One of the distinctive and invaluable gifts of religion to social reconstruction should be insight—insight into the tangled maze of public events, a deeper and truer reading of immediate problems. This is not believed today. If there is one thing which religion lacks, we often say, it is realism. Nevertheless, it is realism that has been one of the certain marks of vital religion whenever it has been true and powerful. It actually adds to our wisdom, to our understanding of the facts of history. Personal religion's gift to public problems is not merely, as is so often said, character which shall follow and utilize knowledge, directing it to high purpose, but also a truer comprehension of the facts themselves, greater knowledge.

Precisely how religion's insight is derived, it is not easy to declare. Certainly not by adding information, facts. Partly it proceeds from the possession of a broader and truer perspective. Religion should lift one up from the swirling stream of history, where sound judgment is impossible, to a place of relative quiet and of higher vantage-ground; there one may survey the flux with some detachment; there one may bring the powers of a steady and unbiased mind to bear upon its meaning; there one may open a receptive consciousness to the imprint of its significance; and thereby one may perceive more truly and judge more com-

petently. There is much talk about fleeing to personal religion for escape from life. But there is a rising to religion for a true view of life, that one may return into the maelstrom with some gift of criticism, of wisdom, of prophecy.

But that is not the whole secret of religion's insight. There is a deeper issue here. It lies in the baffling but vitally important question of the relation of character to understanding, even political and economic understanding. It is at the most difficult and delicate point in the whole range of human life—the point where ethical devotion actually quickens insight, and quickened insight controls action. Religion furnishes wisdom not by adding information, but by supplying norms through which that information may rightly be appraised, by sensitizing and training men's latent intuitive sense for the value of facts and the meaning of events. All supremely important truth is truth of value. And not least, economic and political truths, involving as they do the intimate destinies of mankind's millions. Such truth can rightly be understood only in the light of its ethical significance. There are prerequisites to its sound comprehension and appraisal. They are prerequisites consonant with the character of the truth desired—prerequisites of ethical sensitivity, of moral character.

This contention will not readily be accepted. Or, if it is, it will be a perfunctory assent which is belied by our working assumptions. Nevertheless, it is the claim of religion. It is Christianity's profound conviction that the ultimate factors and forces which surround mankind's life in the large and determine its advance and retreat—the conditions of its true progress—are ethical in character. Therefore a true appraisal of their significance can be had only through ethical understanding. By the same token, wisdom for mankind's advance is to be sought primarily through deeper apprehension of the moral character of reality. It should proceed from the life of personal religion.

The R. O. T. C. Juggernaut

As the Supreme Court of the United States declines to review the Ennis Coale case, in which a student is seeking reinstatement in the University of Maryland without taking military training, a similar case involving two students in California goes to the courts. Albert Hamilton and Alonzo Reynolds have been formally expelled from the University of California at Los Angeles for the sole reason that they have not complied with the Regents-made rule that every able-bodied male student who is a citizen must take military drill for two years.

John Beardsley, lawyer for the young men, feels that this case contains certain elements not apparent in the Maryland case, and he hopes to keep it from becoming entangled in a maze of irrelevant points. Whether the Regents have the constitutional right to

exclude students from the state university because their religious beliefs will not permit them to take military drill is the issue at stake.

A consideration of the nature of the Reserve Officers Training Corps as an educational machine for creating the war-mind, the Regents would like to avoid. Mr. George Cochran, a member of the Board of Regents, and at the same time Chairman of the Board of the University of Southern California, a large private institution, states in the press in behalf of the Board of Regents that "R. O. T. C. is merely a form of physical training, which has been required for a long time." This, in part, was the answer offered to the petition of the committee of ministers for exemption for conscientious objectors. Mr. Cochran felt that the ruling was just, because if students did not like this provision they might go elsewhere. But he failed to suggest what might be used for money to pay tuitions of from \$300 up.

The khaki-uniformed freshmen and sophomores are being taken to the auditorium these days to listen to lectures by army officers on "the situation in the Far East." The talks thus far have emphasized the vicious plans of the "Japs" to establish a Far Eastern Empire, and the meaning of this intention for American "interests," and the menace of Bolshevism in China. The speeches, in characteristic military jargon, give reasons for a strong military and naval program, and suggest indirectly what use we can make of this machinery of war.

When the Provost, Ernest C. Moore, is asked what he thinks about permitting such propaganda to be carried on under the auspices of the R. O. T. C., he fails to be alarmed, and expresses the thought that one would naturally go to our military authorities to discover what plans are being promoted by Japanese military men. Yet the college newspaper is closed to student discussion of the R. O. T. C. by request of the Provost, who seems to feel that the paper ought not to be used for propaganda purposes. The editor is an officer in the R. O. T. C., and editorializes on its behalf from time to time without administrative objection. Last spring, when the National Student Federation was taking its national poll to discover how many American students would accept or refuse war service, the Provost suppressed the ballots and forbade the taking of the poll, asserting that such a vote could not be taken on the State University campus because it promoted pacifist propaganda.

With all avenues on the campus closed to the expression of a natural student interest and concern in this case, and in the larger issue it involves, the Southern California Congress of Youth, composed of representatives from all Southern California colleges and many other youth groups, proposes to make this issue of militarism in education one of its major points of concentration. It staged a huge mass meeting in a

down-town church, featuring "All Quiet on the Western Front," and presenting Dr. Frank Fagerburg, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Al Hamilton and Alonzo Reynolds.

Church, student, and all groups working for peace in Southern California will be asked to make the Hamilton-Reynolds case the focusing point for a great public campaign against the rising tide of nationalism and war preparedness.

Spain Swings Back

While the sporadic attempts at assassination, the senseless bombings, and the inept revolutionary horse-play which have characterized the latest rebellion of Spain's anarcho-syndicalists make the situation of the Republic most unfortunate, far more serious is the setback to the forces of the Left in the elections of November 19 and the run-off elections of December 3. As far as the anarcho-syndicalists are concerned, they present an extraordinary social phenomenon: for the technique of revolt followed by them is so indiscriminate, so brutal, and so uniformly ineffective that even the most radical wings of world communism long since repudiated the whole method of isolated terrorism; yet the anarcho-syndicalists have built up in Spain, notably in Barcelona and Seville, and in many industrial towns of the northwest, a strong movement numbering well on toward a million followers. They can, of course, paralyze train services here and there, pile up dead in the ranks of their enemies and in their own organization; but that is about all. This is the third effort they have made to destroy the government, and it is worth noting that they have shown themselves just as willing to fight by terror the moderate radicals as the extreme reactionaries. They have no program of government except a mixture of the "One Big Union" slogan and visionary absence of law; but to their banners have rallied at times substantial numbers of workers who have become disillusioned over the failure of successive ministries to bring about as rapid a revolution in economic terms as they had hoped for. They could not conceivably run the country if it were put into their hands; they supply an argument for every backward group to use as an appeal for support by the unaffiliated; but they can make trouble for everybody in Spain, friends of revolutionary change and foes alike.

It was certain, however, that the election which almost wiped out the center parties would precipitate sterner conflict between the Right and the Left. As a matter of fact, a sharper division was to be welcomed; for when realism enters politics, it often settles down at last to a realignment based on genuine issues. Thus the trend to the Right is understandable and, incidentally, less startling than it has appeared to those who knew little of the background. The Socialists, who had 117 deputies in the Cortes previously, were

reduced to 61; but it must be remembered that in the other elections they ran many candidates in fusion with leftist republicans, whereas this time they cut loose from all middle class support and ran alone. Their party dues-paying membership has tripled and their influence in the trade unions has pulled behind them over a million organized workers. They are now free from the greatest danger that can confront a Socialist party in such a land of multiple parties—namely, compromise after compromise in an effort to hold power, until the course of the German Social Democrats is followed to its inevitable outcome. From this the vigor of Spanish Socialism has saved itself. For, contrary to the bigoted, Socialist-baiting editorial in *The New Republic* for November 29 (which for charming simplicity and naiveté might have been printed in *The Daily Worker*, and which places blame for everything chiefly on the Socialists), it was not because of the Socialist Party's conservatism that it was attacked, but because of its adherence to Socialist ideas and its impatience with a merely political revolution.

The chief danger is, of course, that irresponsible attacks on all governmental institutions by the anarcho-syndicalists, and eagerness to mix in on the side of conservatism among the monarchists and Fascists, will prevent any logical development at all. A general breakdown of Spanish institutions would not lead to a genuine economic revolution, but in all probability to a Right dictatorship, not necessarily monarchist but not far from it in social emphasis. It is not yet certain whether the new and powerful bloc in the Cortes under the malignant influence of Gil Robles, reactionary editor of the reactionary paper, *El Debate*, will carry on a pretense of constitutional rule or will frankly move toward an increasingly Fascist type of government.

If the latter should happen, the conservatives will have to thank the illiterate and dominated new women voters of Spain, well toward five million of whom went to the polls for the first time. The minority of Socialists and Left Republicans who at the time of the revolution opposed the immediate granting of woman suffrage without a campaign of preliminary education seem fully justified by events. But behind the women stand other powerful forces. There seems abundant evidence that the infuriated grandees, 254 of whom were named recently as about to be dispossessed of their ill-gotten lands, bribed voters by wholesale, and that the revolutionary fervor which had held the usual vote-selling down almost to zero in the spring of 1931, has evaporated under the impact of the depression. Big business, disgruntled over the persistent loss of strikes under the new Socialist-conceived laws placing the government practically on the side of labor, used every means to whip their workers into line. Monarchist funds were tapped freely. The middle class liberals, in the standard manner of liberals everywhere

at a critical juncture, demonstrated their liberalism by turning conservative. Most influential of all, of course, was the Pope and the Catholic hierarchy, whose generous statesman-like qualities in many situations have appeared wholly atrophied in Spain, and who threw the vast weight of traditional loyalties into an effort to restore the prestige of their former days.

In the present instability, one does not need to be an insistent partisan to see that the Socialist Party and the Socialist trade unions constitute together the one strong, constructive, revolutionary force in Spain.

Deep Down Under Lynching

An appalling revival of lynching is sweeping across the land. There was a time when the harvest of lynching mobs exceeded 100 victims per year, but in recent decades the number of mob-murders has diminished substantially. Now the lust for blood has again assumed terrifying proportions.

Among the numberless solutions being proposed, three stand out: speed up the processes of justice so that criminals may more certainly be apprehended and made to feel the penalty of the law; make far more drastic the punishment meted out to wrongdoers; and enact a Federal law against lynching. The case for the first and third of these proposals is unassailable. The ease with which crime may now be committed with only a low mathematical probability that the criminal will ever be made to bear the full burden of a just legal sentence constitutes a scandal. And the urgent necessity of a national law against lynching and the placing of responsibility for its enforcement in the hands of Federal authorities, who are less swayed by local passions than State and community officials, is beyond question.

But the theory that drastic punishment is a deterrent to crime cannot be validated by the record of criminology. There was not less crime but more during the days when a hundred offenses were punishable with death, and there is not less crime in those states which now resort to capital punishment than in states which refrain from the practice. This fallacious theory is popular because it makes a scapegoat of the criminal and tends to relieve society of responsibility for the acts of its lawless members.

The truth of the matter is that lawlessness and crime are rooted in the prevailing mode of life in the United States. Granted the greed and ruthlessness and callousness of our economic and political system, crime is inevitable and ineradicable. So long as each successive generation is taught to grab for itself and let the devil take the hindmost; so long as the investing public is fleeced by legal but outrageous manipulation of the stock market and the public treasury defrauded by legal but immoral devices on the part of rich taxpayers; so long as vested interests resort to legal and extra-legal acts of violence in protecting property

rights against the just claims of exploited workers; and so long as patriots feel obliged to go out and slaughter citizens of other nations—that long will we continue to be engulfed in a never-ending series of crime waves.

The difference between legality and criminality seems extremely important to respectable middle-class people, while in moral quality there may be no ground for distinction. The damage done to society by a second-store man is inconsequential in contrast to the havoc wrought by such leading citizens as Insull, Mitchell and Wiggin, all of whom are still dwelling in luxurious liberty. The loss of life occasioned by machine guns in the hands of racketeers is lamentable but incomparably less than the casualties of an unjust and ruthless economic system. A thousand times more innocent men, women and children die at the hands of impassioned patriots than are killed by members of the "criminal class."

Pouring rosewater on a loathsome cancer is about as efficacious as the effort to cure crime by savage punishment meted out to the offender.

Industrial Democracy Investigated

Two idealistic experiments in industry have been hailed by American liberals during the past decade as pointing toward a new day in relations between owners and employees—the proposals of "Golden Rule" Nash in Cincinnati and of William P. Hapgood in Indianapolis. Some years ago critical reports on the Nash plant were made by various groups of investigators and eventually the company entered into an arrangement with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers for the complete unionization of all departments. Since the death of Mr. Nash we have heard nothing further of the experiment, and it now appears to be merely another union shop.

For many months now echoes of discord at the Columbia Conserve Company have been resounding across the country. THE WORLD TOMORROW has refrained from comment until authentic data became available. The Committee of Four has finally made its report, and now the story can be told. About 15 years ago Mr. William P. Hapgood, with the coöperation of his brothers Norman and Hutchins, established a canning factory with the avowed purpose of demonstrating the possibilities of democracy in industry. The degree of responsibility placed upon the workers was gradually increased until it exceeded that obtaining in any other plant in the United States. A system was also devised whereby the ownership of the company would pass by stages into the hands of the employees. From a thousand pulpits, lecture platforms and class rooms, the Hapgood experiment was heralded as the most advanced form of industrial democracy.

Now the whole scheme is on the rocks. About a year ago the quarrel between Mr. Hapgood and some of the ablest veteran workers became so acute that in February, with the consent of all parties concerned,

Sherwood Eddy, Jerome Davis, Paul H. Douglas, and James Myers were requested to serve as a committee for the purpose of investigating the whole situation and making proposals for the future. Shortly thereafter an agreement was reached by both sides, providing, among other points, that the Board of Directors should have power to discharge workers, in case of gross subordination, but such employees would have the right of appeal to an impartial arbitrator, William M. Leiserson. This agreement was to remain in force until April 1, 1934. Nevertheless, within two months Mr. Hapgood requested the Committee of Four that the company be released from the agreement. Opposition was offered by a group of employees and the committee therefore felt unable to consent. In May the Council adopted a resolution which stated that the "agreement of February 26th is not practical, and with full appreciation of the sincere effort on the part of Messrs. Myers, Eddy, Douglas, Davis and Leiserson . . . we cancel our agreement and ask for withdrawal of the Committee." To which the Committee of Four has now replied:

Our Committee strongly protested this action to the Company, together with other "illegal acts," using that term in the sense of breaches of the agreement. In spite of the fact that the agreement was later cancelled also by the Board of Directors, our Committee feels that the entire procedure of the Company in abrogating the agreement was not in accord with the principles of an honorable understanding. . . . During our own experience with the Columbia Conserve Company during recent weeks, we have observed with deep regret that Mr. William P. Hapgood, although in his philosophy democratic, seems to have proved autocratic in dealing with the workers. . . . It seemed to the Committee that the leaders of those who dared openly to differ with the management were forced out or felt impelled to resign, until effective industrial democracy had disappeared.

This disappointing outcome of a notable experiment reveals unmistakably the inadequacy, if not the actual futility, of the movement to transform industry through the paternal benevolence of the owners. Even if Mr. Hapgood had proved to be as democratic in practice as he was in theory, the ultimate significance of his experiment would have been slight, in relation to the totality of the problem involved. The evidence is conclusive that genuine democracy in industry cannot be achieved by isolated efforts. Not by employee-ownership and employee-management are the evils of capitalism to be exorcised. Collective action on the part of workers organized in national unions and in a national political party is essential. Nothing short of the socialization of natural resources and basic industries will suffice. Therefore, it seems to us that deeper wisdom has been displayed by Powers Hapgood, who left his father's plant to become a national organizer for the Socialist Party. The collapse of the experiment in industrial democracy at the Columbia Conserve Com-

pany is partly the result of a failure of the human spirit, but much more it is a consequence of an inadequate social philosophy and an incorrect social strategy.

Victory for the Church in Germany

The Protestant church of Germany is thus far the only force which has gained a victory over the Nazi totalitarian state. The Aryan paragraph has been abolished, the "German Christians," proponents of Nazi principles in the church, have been dissolved, and the army chaplain who was elevated to the highest position in the church because he was a friend of Hitler's will probably lose his position. The victory was gained partly because there were enough men in the church to defy the state power and partly because international church pressure gave pause to the Nazis. It is rumored that intimations from both the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of Upsala, primate of the Swedish church, that a church which adopted the Aryan paragraph would not be regarded as Christian had considerable weight in the matter.

Secular journals which are usually inimical to organized religion have paid glowing tributes to the courage of the German church, and they are on the whole deserved. Nevertheless, *THE WORLD TOMORROW*, which is naturally more friendly to institutions of religion than journals of secular radicalism, is bound to point out that the victory of the German church can easily be overestimated. It is the distinctive characteristic of Lutheran spirituality that it does not "mix" in politics. It opposes political authority only when the state presumes to enter the inner sanctuary of religion. That it can fight with heroic courage in such a moment events in Germany have proved. But not a word of protest has come from the German Protestant church in opposition to the anti-Semitism or to the tyranny of the state as such. In fact, the church has again and again either implied or explicitly stated that it welcomes the Nazi state and that it does not presume to judge its actions. The pessimistic realism of Lutheran spirituality easily tempts it to regard state tyranny as necessary to "hold a world of sin in check," and the middle-class character of the church prompts it to welcome a tyranny which prevents the abhorred violence of a revolution.

Radical Christians will, for this reason, view the events in German church history with reserved approval. They will recognize in them verification of their belief that religious conviction, honestly held, generates more courage than rationalistic liberalism. But they will know that the church is still on the side of reaction. As a matter of fact, some of the clerics who are opposing the Nazis in Germany today would like to substitute a monarchy for the totalitarian state. And they may have their hopes realized. But in that case no one, with the possible exception of the Jews, would gain an advantage from the change.

Beyond Gold Tinkering

NORMAN THOMAS

MAY a man who on the very controversial subject of money does not wholly agree either with Al Smith or Father Coughlin, President Roosevelt or Professor Sprague, express a few sentiments which seem to him pertinent?

For practical purposes we are probably justified in speaking of inflation as existing when the price level rises sharply and of deflation when the price level falls. More precisely inflation exists when the volume of money, including not only currency but bank credits subject to checks, increases faster than the volume of productive goods. Deflation exists when the contrary is true, when the volume of money, including bank credits subject to checks, increases less rapidly than the volume of goods. Up to the time we went off the gold standard we had deflation. This deflation was not in the amount of currency in circulation. According to figures used by Professor Sprague, there was actually about \$1,800,000,000 more in cash in circulation and in the cash reserve of the Federal Reserve Bank in June 1933 than in June 1926. But the wholesale price index of the Labor Bureau declined in that same period from 100 to a point below 70. The deflation was in bank credits, loans, investments, etc. In 1926 these loans and investments were in excess of 50 billions. In 1933 they were below 40 billions. Part of this deflation was the result of failures, bankruptcies, foreclosures. The breakdown of our banking system itself was responsible for much of it.

From the beginning President Roosevelt had to bring about some inflation or reflation. This he did at first with general approval. In an emergency nobody protested against our going off the gold standard and beginning that controlled inflation or reflation which I alone among the Presidential candidates had said would be virtually inevitable unless we wanted to continue an epidemic of deflation. The outcry only began when the President started a policy of purchasing gold, at first in America and then in the world market, in the effort presumably to restore the 1926 price level. This gold purchase plan, it was understood, was in line with the theory of Professor George Frederick Warren, who held that we need a commodity dollar—not of itself a bad idea at all—and that we could get a commodity dollar scientifically by manipulating the price of gold. Most economists rejected his thesis, claiming that it was not true. So far his theory has not been borne out. As Professor Kemmerer, of Princeton, has pointed out, despite the depression of the gold value of our paper dollar by about $7\frac{3}{4}$ per cent under

the President's purchase plan, commodity prices in general have fallen since the experiment was begun. Inflation hasn't happened, but conservative people were scared, there was what is called a flight from the dollar, and, what is more important, there was considerable alarm and confusion in Europe by what was thought to be a beginning of a war of gold. For all these reasons I am not, and never was, enamored of the President's plan. But as inflation it was certainly mild medicine, and it is just possible that politically the President has played a rather clever trick by getting the sound money folks to attack him so hard that the rabid inflationists feel that they must stand by him.

NOW what about all these developments from a Socialist standpoint? I am going to set down in numbered paragraphs some conclusions that seem to me reasonable:

1. Our money system has plenty of faults, but it did not cause the disintegration of capitalism, of which the great depression is one symptom. It must be regarded, rather, as an integral part of capitalism. I have not the space or the ability to do here what Fred Henderson, the English Socialist and economist, has done brilliantly in his books, *Money Power* and *Foundations for the World's New Age of Plenty*, in which he has made it clear how essentially our system of money and credit is part of our property and profit mechanism. The production of new goods is attended under our system by the production of new debts which must be paid to those who advance credit. Yet credit essentially is a social creation. Socially it is nothing but the right of workers to live on what has been produced while they produce something more. But this is today a property right of capital—a right often attacked by other property owners who resent its excessive claim, but nevertheless an essential part of the property system to which they give allegiance.

2. If the disintegration of capitalism is due to the failure of the system of private ownership of natural resources and productive machinery and their operation for profit, and not merely to a failure of our particular form of money, then we cannot cure that disintegration by tinkering with the currency. We can have a monetary system that is more or less bad. Great individual suffering may arise from the wrong sort of tinkering with money. Some relief may come from the right handling of money. But no money scheme can make a fundamental change in the class ratio of distribution which assigns the rich rewards to property owners and

maintenance to workers. We may have wholesale deflation or wholesale inflation. We may, like the Indians, make money out of clam shells, or run it off the presses, as they did in Germany. After the orgy is over, if we still keep capitalism the House of Morgan or its equivalents will be sitting on the top of the heap just as before. Even so radical a plan as Major Douglas's social credit won't do the job. As Mr. Henderson points out, one cannot use profit as the principle to foster production, and its opposite, the social dividend, to secure distribution—not, that is, at the same time and without fundamentally changing the profit and property mechanism under which we now operate. The important thing is to change capitalism and to begin the job right away. In the process we can find ways to adapt Major Douglas's principle of the social dividend to our end. We cannot do it under the New Deal without blowing things up.

3. Any *uncontrolled* inflation will make matters worse for most of us than they are at present. Certain debtors may be temporarily helped because they can pay back their debts in cheaper money. For a little while there will appear to be a stimulus to business. But wages will lag behind prices, and salaries of white collar workers will probably lag even farther behind because they are not organized. Savings banks and insurance funds will be wiped out. Wage workers and farmers may profit at first, but they will soon find that they have to pay enormous prices for what they buy and that the wage workers won't be able to buy agricultural products. Inflation jags of a wholesale sort always have a terrible hangover.

4. Reflation, or controlled and directed inflation, is another matter. We have been having it. We might continue to have it up to the 1926 level, at which many of our debts were incurred. If the Administration and the labor unions had between them written into the codes a provision that minimum wages would automatically rise as the index of the cost of living rises, that itself would have been a preventative of wholesale inflation. I do not mean that it would have stopped inflation after it started but that it would keep in check plans for wholesale inflation. Speculators who know that inflation does not add to the national income but only redivides it would not be so keen for it if they knew that automatically the workers would get their share; that wages would rise in step with prices. To the extent that that is done inflation tends to be a mere bookkeeping matter. Prices rise about evenly with salaries and wages, which is not what your real inflationists want.

5. Probably the goal, or rather the temporary goal, of reflation is some sort of stabilization. Gold is such a fetish that stabilization will have to take account of it. This is particularly true because there are always international transactions to settle and there are such differences in levels of production and stand-

ards of living that a fetish like gold has its uses. Silver might have secondary uses, especially in Asia. But by and large it's bad enough to deal with one fluctuating commodity as a nominal base of currency without adding another. We want to outgrow the fetish stage. Any valuable stabilization will have to work on the basis of a dollar which has an even purchasing power not for one commodity but for the general average.

6. On the way to stabilization—or, for all I know, along with it—I can't for the life of me see why it may not be possible to pay for public works, especially self-liquidating public works, by issuing treasury notes to be retired in due order instead of interest-bearing bonds. Why do we add to our burden of debt when we are creating new national wealth? I should be against printing bills to pay the running expenses of government, but public works which create new wealth are different, and the principle of getting them without increasing the debt may be valuable for the future. Of course the amount of money thus issued would have to be controlled with reference to its effect upon the general price level, for such money does get into general circulation.

7. Finally—and this is perhaps the most important point of all—the real reason for the cry for inflation is a sound one. The country staggers under a prodigious burden of debt. That debt burden absorbed 20 per cent of our national income last year just in debt service. It may absorb a lower proportion of the national income this year, but it will be greater in total. Our national debt seems likely to pass in the very near future the height of indebtedness during the World War, and it is a crushing burden. No society has ever carried anything like it. Repeatedly in history debts have been wiped out by whole or partial repudiation; by some sort of confiscation; by wholesale deflation, that is, foreclosure, and bankruptcy; or by wholesale inflation such as that which the French used when they wiped out four-fifths of their internal debt by reducing the value of the franc and then stabilizing it at one-fifth of its former value.

All these means of reducing or wiping out debts are unscientific and inequitable. They usually hurt the wrong people. They may destroy a whole middle class and all the savings of the working class. They do not destroy capitalism, which promptly creates a new middle class, as it did in Germany. The scientific and equitable way to reduce the burden of debt is to add it all up—public and private—and then determine what part of it must be wiped out. The government, in wiping out part of this burden, must take over a share of the debt now borne by private concerns or individuals. It must get compensation in terms of social control and then proceed to levy taxes on personally owned wealth. Such wealth is really a social creation. To take some of it back is restitution, not confiscation. It is restitution for the good of society and,

in the long run, of the individuals who compose society. For administrative reasons a graduated tax should begin, let us say, at the \$100,000 level. It should be paid in money, in bonds which can be retired, or in stocks of corporations that it is desirable to socialize in any case. Even capitalism might afford to use this method better than wholesale infla-

tion or crushing deflation. But it will not, because the thought of it gives capitalism the jitters. A society resolved to go Socialist would find a capital levy, added to proper income and inheritance taxation, a magnificent means for the orderly transfer of productive goods from a system of individual ownership to one of social possession.

Making Radicalism Effective

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

EVENTS in Europe have proven conclusively that no American radical movement can be successful if it is not able to achieve to a greater extent than did European radicalism a unity and political cohesion among the various classes which a disintegrating capitalism disinherits. The failure to achieve this unity led to the victory of fascism in Germany. The frantic hope of American radicals that mere acceleration of propaganda and organization activities will avert the danger of fascism here is unrealistic. The German radical movement was numerically more powerful than any American radical movement can hope to be for some years. If there is any hope in avoiding fascism in this country, it must rest upon the ability of American radicals to profit from the lessons of Europe sufficiently to develop an entirely new strategy. And the most important problem of that strategy is the organizing of all types and classes of the disinherited into a unified political group.

A disintegrating capitalism brings poverty not only to the workers, but to the farmers and to the lower middle classes. If all the dispossessed could be united, those who benefit from the perpetuation of an unjust social and economic system would not be able to maintain themselves against the proponents of a new social order. The difficulty in Germany has been that the farmers and lower middle classes became the tools of fascism against the workers, and that the workers themselves were divided into two political parties.

It is, of course, futile to hope that even the most adequate political strategy could ever completely unite the various classes of the dispossessed. There are elements in the middle classes, particularly the small traders and the white collar workers, who will flee into the arms of reaction in the day of crisis no matter how perfect the strategy of the radical party. But the potential conservatism of these classes can be greatly reduced by a radicalism which is more perfectly adjusted to the requirements of the modern situation.

The strategy which would be most likely to accomplish the task of healing or mitigating these divisions

among the dispossessed could be most briefly described as a Marxism which disavows revisionism and parliamentary optimism in the field of politics and economics, but which is frankly revisionist in dealing with psychological and cultural forces which orthodox Marxism has not fully comprehended. The turn to the left politically will tend to heal the breach among the workers, and the turn to the right culturally will tend to heal the breach between the workers and the other dispossessed classes.

The necessity of a political turn to the left is revealed by countless lessons in the past. The evolutionary hopes of parliamentary Socialists rested largely upon their confidence in the possibilities of the instruments of democracy as potential weapons in the hands of the workers. Democracy still holds some advantages to the workers' movement which must not be sacrificed; but it is now quite apparent that the dominant economic power can abrogate democracy in the hour in which that democracy becomes a threat to its continued authority. Recent events have proven quite conclusively that an uncritical attachment to, and an implicit trust in, the institutions of democracy will betray the workers in the hour of crisis.

The lessons of the past destroy not only the parliamentary but even the evolutionary hopes of traditional Socialists. It is now quite apparent that the ability of labor parties to press concessions from the lords of industry and finance is no proof of their ability to gain the final concession of a new collectivist society. The oligarchs of any society may yield certain privileges under pressure, but they will not yield the power which is the source of their privileges without a struggle. Furthermore their prestige, though impaired, remains in such a struggle as long as there is any hope that they can keep their kind of social organization functioning. It is only by a complete breakdown of function that power can be transferred from one class of society to another. No successful oligarchy can be made to yield its power. It does not have to yield its power if it remains even partially successful. Prestige is the guarantor of power; and power therefore

remains impregnable until prestige is almost completely impaired.

The events of the past few years prove furthermore that an imperiled financial and industrial oligarchy will try every device short of a change in the system of economic ownership to revive the halted operation of its system. It will try planning within the limits of private ownership, inflation, tariffs, import quotas, etc. It is now quite apparent that some of these devices momentarily arrest the decay of capitalism and that others aggravate it. There is therefore no possibility of health for a revived capitalism, though there is a possibility of lingering disease before death. If this lesson is clearly learned, a political strategy based upon the expectation of catastrophe rather than upon evolutionary hopes emerges. It is the strategy of a socialism which has renounced the alloy of liberalism that filtered into its thought in the days of prosperity.

Such a strategy will promote unity in the ranks of the workers. It will not wholly overcome the conservatism of workers who have a small stake in the present system and are therefore inclined to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune rather than fly to evils that they know not of. It will not automatically destroy the conflict between trade union tactics and revolutionary strategy. But it can at least prevent the rise of a mistaken philosophy of history from the partial perspectives and mistaken hopes of those who have not yet felt the full brunt of a disintegrating social system.

THE argument up to this point would seem to point to a capitulation of socialism to communism as the way out of the present difficulties of radicalism. Among left-wing Socialists this is the general tendency. There is no question that the most vital elements in American socialism are turning left in this fashion, that the conservative opposition to this tendency is inspired by little more than frantic and pathetic loyalty to a discredited tradition and that if the thought of Socialists does not go beyond this point it can not find a resting place until it reaches communism.

Communism, unfortunately, aggravates the problem of the division of the dispossessed in other ways. It remained impotent in Germany in spite of the glaring mistakes of the Socialists, and there is no evidence of any great potential Communistic strength in this country. The real basis of this impotence is the failure of communism to deal adequately with the cultural and psychological factors of a complex Western civilization. Its intransigent attitude toward all forms of culture which have any organic relation to the capitalistic social system needlessly antagonizes the farmers and the lower middle classes. The trouble with communism is not its doctrine of violence but its spirit of vindictiveness. It is the preaching of hatred rather than

violence that is dangerous. Hatred is a form of blindness. No one imagines that a social struggle can be conducted without the emergence of some vindictiveness. But when vindictiveness is made into a creed, a blind hatred of every cultural form which happens to be incompatible with the culture of a dispossessed urban worker develops. Thus the Communist is unable to understand the farmer.

The farmer has a very ancient culture. He has psychological and spiritual attitudes which will never be quite the same as that of an urban worker. When an urban worker imagines that a collectivized factory system must be forced upon the farmer because it is good for the farmer he is fooling himself. He is merely revealing a form of vindictive imperialism. He is trying to force his characteristic ideals upon the man of the soil. The man of the soil will submit to that only if, as in Russia, he has no political power to defend himself. In Western nations the farmers and peasants still have political power; and they will use it to defeat the worker, even at the price of becoming tools of the capitalists. This conflict could be avoided or mitigated if the worker would recognize that it is more natural and possible to satisfy the desire for limited possession in the soil than in a factory. A factory must be collectively owned if it is not to become the instrument of oppression. But the qualified ownership of a farm need not represent power. It may merely represent the opportunity to perform social function, and the ability to satisfy the man of the soil's natural desire to identify himself with the land he loves. A collectivist society will not, of course, allow unqualified ownership. But it can allow ownership, including the right of testation, in so far as it is consistent with the use of what is owned. If this should make for too small units of production, the creation of larger units should depend upon voluntary coöperation; and the economic advantage of such coöperation would be the incentive to establish it.

THE Communist is wrong not only in his approach to the farm problem economically: he is wrong in his approach to cultural problems. Farmers share with the middle classes of the city certain loyalties to established traditions and feel themselves outraged by the cultural nihilism of the Communist. The Communist, and the orthodox Socialist as well, is a rationalistic internationalist. He regards national sentiment as an unfortunate irrationality or even as a proof of moral turpitude. He is quite right in placing class loyalty in competition with national loyalty. But national sentiment is a much more powerful and perennial force than he realizes. His dream of the workers of the world uniting is, in fact, quite unrealistic in some of its aspects. Revolutions may gain a little, but only a very little, help from the workers of other countries. Most successful revolutions are born out of the nation itself.

Trotsky was certain that the Russian revolution could succeed only if a world revolution supported it. Stalin, with greater realism, is developing the Russian revolution without much hope of aid from a world revolution.

There is a lesson in that which Communists have not yet applied by way of revising their ideology and strategy. The rationalistic internationalism of communism is a heritage of the Age of Reason. Together with communism's attitude toward the family, it reveals that the Communists do not sufficiently appreciate the organic relations of life. This lack of realism not only leads to false hopes in the field of politics but antagonizes the lower middle classes among whom traditional mythologies which do justice to the organic and perennial social relations of man are still held. Communism, in fact, makes the mistake of trying to eradicate some aspects of culture which it regards as capitalistic or bourgeois but which are in fact merely human. With Communists the word "bourgeois" has become purely symbolic and stands for everything they hate. The characteristic culture of the peasant and the man of the soil is older than bourgeois life and is only slightly corrupted by the latter.

An adequate American revolutionary movement must for this reason be as diligent in revising Com-

munist ideology as Socialist strategy. It must not let the spirit of vindictiveness betray it into futile and politically dangerous opposition to traditional forms of culture which contain more values than the Communist realizes and which are not as purely or as inevitably instruments of reaction as he believes. It must be politically more realistic than socialism has been without allowing its realism to betray it into undue cynicism. That is a difficult task. But it is not an impossible one if the lessons of Europe are heeded. If it is performed, an American revolutionary movement can arise in which American revolutionary tradition will be exploited, the peculiar circumstances of American life will have justice done them and all those who are disinherited by capitalism will have a fair opportunity to unite in one effective radical party, looking to the establishment of a collectivist society. The creation of such a radicalism will require prodigious organizing energy. But before the organization work is undertaken there must be some vital thinking and rethinking of traditional positions. At present all efforts at revision are inhibited by the effort of Socialists and Communists to justify themselves at each other's expense. We must learn from both the virtues and the mistakes of every radical party.

Conscience and Federal Jurisdiction

EDWIN C. JOHNSON

ON November 20 the United States Supreme Court announced its decision not to consider the appeal of Ennis Coale, student conscientious objector to military training, for exemption from the compulsory military courses at the University of Maryland. This action of the Supreme Court follows on two decisions previously rendered in Coale's case after his suspension from the University of Maryland over a year ago.

The first decision, prepared by Judge Joseph N. Ulman, of Baltimore Superior Court, last January, sustained every contention made in Coale's behalf and granted his petition for reinstatement to the University with exemption from military requirements. The second decision in the Coale case, prepared by the Maryland Court of Appeals last June, reversed the Ulman ruling and denied any religious conscientious objector, even Quakers, the legal right to exemption from the University's military requirements. The Supreme Court's action, accompanied by a brief statement saying the case was dismissed "for the want of a substantial Federal question," was a refusal to pass upon Coale's appeal from the second decision, which

upheld the legality of the University's action in denying him his education because of his refusal to participate in the compulsory military work.

By way of implications of the Supreme Court's dismissal of the Coale case, it can be confidently stated, in the first place, that the action of the Supreme Court does not contain the slightest hint of the Court's attitude toward either litigant in the case. In other words, by dismissing the case the Court has not indicated that it believes the University's cause more just or legally correct than Coale's action and plea, or vice versa. With respect to the conflicting factors and interests the Supreme Court has remained silent and neutral. It can be quite as confidently asserted, in the second place, that the Court's declination to entertain the Coale case does not contain any implication with respect to the defensibility of either of the two decisions previously rendered in the case. Dismissing the Coale case was not, in other words, the Supreme Court's manner of indicating that it considered the reactionary decision of the Maryland Court of Appeals more correct than the enlightened Ulman decision.

While the Supreme Court's refusal to consider the

case implied nothing of the Court's attitude toward the respective litigants, or toward the first or second court decisions given in the case, the Court's action in so doing does contain certain implications for the basic issues raised by the case. What these implications are can only be guessed at, for the Court in dismissing the case did not comment on its essential merits. Three such guesses suggest themselves:

First, the Court's action may imply that it considered the military training requirement at the University of Maryland a state, rather than a Federal matter. It would have been easy to err on this point, for our American tradition of local and state responsibility for education is axiomatic, sacrosanct, not readily questioned. But the Maryland military unit, as are all R. O. T. C. units, is authorized by Federal statute, is financed by Federal funds, is administered and controlled by a Federal agency—the War Department—and is maintained for a specific Federal objective, namely to provide reserve officers for our Federal military establishment. It is too little realized that the military training provisions of the National Defense Act, projecting as they do the mailed fist of the War Department upon state and local educational authorities, are a standing violation of our traditional policy of local autonomy and control in education.

Second, does the Supreme Court's decision not to pass upon the Coale case imply that the Court considers the problem of the conscientious objector a local or state, and not a Federal, matter? It is almost inconceivable that this should be so, for have we not long and generally assumed the Federal Constitution contains protective guarantees for the religious conscience? This assumption has led to the passage of numerous Congressional statutes exempting religious conscientious objectors from military service during our more important wars. During the Revolution and in the Civil War conscientious objectors were generally exempted, and similar allowances were made in the World War. In fact, during the next war, according to a recently announced War Department policy on mobilization, the conscientious objector will be exempted from combat service.

Third, the refusal to pass judgment upon the Coale case may imply that the Supreme Court considered the military training of the R. O. T. C. as "non-combatant" rather than "combatant" service—to resurrect the arbitrary distinction made for conscientious objectors during the World War—and that, therefore, the Coale case lacks something for validity. But immediately the question arises: Who is to say whether one's conscientious convictions, whatever they may be, are valid or invalid? The arbitrary distinction of combatant as against non-combatant service did not fit all the conscientious objectors during the World War; many objected to non-combatant service. How could it be otherwise? The individual conscience is either

supreme or it is not. If it is, then all external definitions and distinctions—even such as may be considered reasonable by the Supreme Court—are beside the point when they do not receive the voluntary sanction and affirmation of the particular conscience in question.

It would be unprofitable to speculate further on the reasons which actuated the Supreme Court in declining jurisdiction in *Coale v. University of Maryland*, but, for educators and workers for peace, there is one more preëminently practical point to mention. It is this: *The Court's action, negatively at least, once again emphasizes that responsibility for the compulsory feature of military drill in American education rests squarely upon local and State authorities.* Evidence on this point has increased to formidable proportions. In November, 1924, John W. Weeks, then Secretary of War, wrote to a correspondent as follows:

I am pleased to inform you that the National Defense Act does not make military training compulsory at any of the institutions which receive the benefits authorized by the Act. So far as the War Department is concerned, it is optional with the authorities of the school, college or university whether military training shall be an elective or a compulsory course in the curriculum.

In May, 1927, Hubert Work, then the Secretary of the Interior, advanced a similar interpretation, as did also William D. Mitchell, United State Attorney General, in June, 1930.

Local and state authorities cannot deny their responsibility for the existence of that un-American and undemocratic anomaly, military conscription in peacetime. These authorities must bear particular responsibility for its removal and final defeat. Toward this end, then, individuals and groups, more than ever before, must militantly bear down upon local educational and state legislative authorities, for ultimately only through them can we substitute peace education for education in war-making.

Stern Words

WITH stern words jagged as the jutting tor
Of Alpine Matterhorn; sharp-edged and keen
As wild Sierra blades that cleave between
The ribs of earth and pierce the secret door
Of heaven's dome—with such words I abhor
The social system men have made to screen
Their greedy lust for power; vile men so mean
They know not what God made the good earth for.

I speak for those whose souls are dispossessed;
For those whose lives are torn by tooth and claw.
In their names I consign to deepest hell
The whole mad system keeping them oppressed.
If things cannot be changed by dint of law,
Then earth is doomed; it only waits death's knell.

E. GUY TALBOTT

Not in the Headlines

Jingoism in Japan

A correspondent sends us the front cover of a recent issue of the *Tokyo Weekly Journal*. The hideous figure of a man in a gas mask occupies most of the page, with a fleet of airplanes in the background and the figures "1936" in bold type in the foreground. The moral is obvious: "War is coming in 1936, so be prepared!"

Must Take Raids Seriously

A United Press dispatch from Belgrade says that the authorities of Yugoslavia have decided to use real tear gas bombs in a forthcoming sham air raid over Zagreb, because in recent sham raids the inhabitants have failed to take seriously the approaching attack.

At Less Than Half Rate

The rate provided for in the recent public utility contract between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the City of Tupelo, Mississippi, is seven mills a kilowatt-hour, as contrasted with the private corporation's rate of seventeen mills.

Quite a Joke

Ferdinand Pecora: Oh, this investigation is funny?

Harry F. Sinclair: Yes.

Q. Is it still a subject of amusement to you?

A. Rather.

Q. Quite a joke?

A. A little.

In commenting upon this exchange before the Senate investigating committee, *Business Week* says editorially: "Mr. Sinclair's remarks have a certain importance. It does not appear that the transaction whereby 1,130,000 shares of Sinclair stock were unloaded on the public at \$12 millions profit violated either the law or the average ethics of the business world of 1929. But it is fairly evident that Mr. Sinclair's attitude is shared by too many business men. They do not appreciate the seriousness of what is being divulged before the Senate committee, or the inevitable consequences. For some of the revelations have been much more shocking than a comparatively candid piece of predacity like the Sinclair pool. It has been revealed to the public that the greatest of bankers were preaching one thing and practicing another. Full of wise maxims of thrift and rugged honesty, they were yet not too fastidious to sell short the stock of their own institutions, were not too squeamish to take advantage of their own associates, and were—most appalling fact of all—ready to fill their own banks with shaky loans if only there was a personal profit in the deal."

War-Resistance at N. Y. U.

The resolutions adopted, almost unanimously, by the 200 delegates at the recent anti-war convention at New York University included the following: "We, the N. Y. U. Anti-War Convention, do solemnly pledge that under no circumstances will we support or cooperate with the government of the United States in any war it may conduct. . . . We definitely go on record as advocating the complete abolition of the R. O. T. C. and military training in N. Y. U. and in all other colleges and schools throughout the country."

The American Dole

The Federal Emergency Relief Fund announces that it is planning to distribute among the nation's impoverished and unemployed the following supplies per month: nine million pounds of butter, 30 to 50 million pounds of pork, 10 million dozen eggs, eight million pounds of beef, in addition to large quantities of coal, shoes, clothing, mattresses, cod-liver oil, and "any number of things that the poor need."

North Dakota Governor Acts

Two proclamations have been issued by Governor Langer in behalf of the bankrupt and impoverished citizens of his state. One ordered judges, sheriffs and other officers of the law to refrain from disposing or evicting tenants or selling household articles to satisfy debt. Another commanded officials to desist absolutely from issuing foreclosure or tax deeds. Justification for this drastic course was presented in these words: "To permit the cold letter of the law to operate and dispossess and evict families in this State during the cold Winter months this year would amount to public calamity, especially in the face of a situation where thousands are desperately in need of Federal aid."

Krzycki on Russian Recognition

The recognition of Soviet Russia by the United States was hailed by the chairman of the Socialist Party of America in these words: "Roosevelt's recognition of Russia is a necessary and inevitable step forward, but recognition by the American people of Russia's ideal—an economic order without private profit—must follow soon if we are to avoid chaos. In fifteen years Russia has built herself up from a weak and poverty-stricken nation to a strong and prosperous one, by concentrating on one principle—the elimination of private profit. . . . We Socialists regret that the Third International has marred the Russian success by its dogmatic and unrealistic insistence that all the rest of the world is exactly like Russia in 1917 and should therefore follow exactly the same course of action."

Fenner Brockway Attacked

The chairman of the Independent Labor Party, outstanding advocate of a united front with the Communists, was bitterly assailed in the December 8th issue of the *Daily Worker*, official organ of the Communist Party of the United States, in an article by William Rust, a leading British Communist. A six-column heading screamed: "BEHIND 'RADICAL' TALK FENNER BROCKWAY, I. L. P. HEAD, SABOTAGES UNITED STRUGGLES." And across the same six columns another heading proclaimed: "TRIES TO FORM 'NEW INTERNATIONAL' TO HIDE TREACHERIES OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND I. L. P. LEADERS." In a box, the *Daily Worker* said editorially: "Like 'our own' Musteites, 'Left' Socialists, and renegades, radical phrases and talk of unity become maneuvers to prevent united struggle for the workers' needs and the means of keeping workers tied to reformist policies and leadership. Brockway's visit to the United States is for the purpose of extending internationally the fight he has waged (behind 'left' phrases) against united struggle and against Communism in Great Britain."

Capitalism in Brazil

Since June, 1931, the Government of Brazil has destroyed, principally by burning, 24 million bags of coffee, each bag weighing 132 pounds, according to a cable received by the New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange. All this coffee was purchased with funds collected through a coffee export tax.

Through Turkish Eyes

The Turkish Translation Service quotes from an open letter published in a Turkish newspaper: "We have read your answer to a questionnaire about war. You say: 'I am all for peace. A mother should always repeat to her child: "War is bad. To kill men is detestable; it is a catastrophe."'" We have read these words of yours with a great feeling of protest, because we cannot bear to be sheep in an age when the world continues to be a wolf. . . . Today it is those of the sect of Jesus that are preparing new catastrophes for mankind; it is they that are crushing more than half the world under their oppression and cruelty. Your words are very true for an English or a French mother. . . . But a Turkish mother should only give this advice to her child: 'Your mother is surrounded by people that pretend friendship; in reality they are watching for some opportunity. This land was bequeathed to you by those who died for it. To assure the existence of this mother country, you too, if need, die and kill! Be ready to die and kill!' Today we may press as a friend's those hands that had wished to strangle us."

A Century Before Hitler

EDWARD G. OLSEN

AMONG the notable misapprehensions of history is the traditional estimate of Johann Gottlieb Fichte as one of the foremost German nationalists of the more fanatical type. For decades Fichte has been lauded by enthusiastic nationalists and denounced by equally enthusiastic internationalists, all because of his famous fourteen *Addresses to the German Nation*, delivered in the winter of 1807-08, after Napoleon had crushed Prussia and had placed an army of occupation in Berlin itself. Under the pressure of conflicting loyalties and emotionalities, Tories and Liberals since that day have alike elevated Fichte, the cosmopolitan philosopher, to the pinnacle of rabid German nationalism and racialism. In 1890, von Treitschke's essay on *Fichte und die nationale Idee* gave a significant emphasis to the Fichtean tradition which has been accepted ever since. In 1914 Bernhardt, Prussian militarist, reaffirmed this general interpretation in his *Germany and the Next War*. And today Fichte is invoked by German Nazis as the patron saint of a morbidly nationalistic Nazi *Kultur*.

But such an interpretation amounts to nothing less than a gross distortion of Fichte's thought and writings, for it is wrested from an overemphasis upon one achievement of a man who was far from consistent in any case. To correct this century-old distortion Dr. H. C. Engelbrecht has produced an impressive and scholarly presentation* of Fichte's political writings in the chronological order of their printed appearance. This treatment permits an objective and intensive examination of the whole subject of Fichte's political ideals and their influence upon the popular sentiment of his time, and enables the reader to note easily both the changes which occurred in Fichte's thinking and the conditioning influences which produced them.

Dr. Engelbrecht's *Johann Gottlieb Fichte* appears at a highly auspicious time, for once again the flames of nationalism are being eagerly fanned throughout the world, and nowhere more fiercely than in Fichte's own fatherland and allegedly under his own aegis. In Dr. Engelbrecht's volume the English-speaking world now for the first time has access to a balanced and authentic portrait of that much maligned and highly glorified German philosopher.

The author well points out that in Fichte's day Germany was but a geographical expression; there was no fatherland but only a host of separated and autonomous states, kingdoms and principalities. Any patriot-

ism that existed therefore tended to be particularistic; nationalism was undeveloped and inarticulate. Since German intellectuals of the time easily saw through the pretensions of the various petty princelings and were at the same time denied a larger object of political loyalty in the form of a national state, they turned, for psychological compensation, to the philosophy of cosmopolitanism. It was into this atmosphere that Fichte was born; beginning life the son of a commoner, he grew up a democratic liberal, believing fervently in the rights of the individual and in the brotherhood of all men.

But with the coming of the French Revolution, new factors beat powerfully upon his consciousness and led finally to a drastic change in his whole political philosophy; it united his democratic and laissez-faire individualism with an idealistic Socialist philosophy and so paved the way for the later emergence of his liberal nationalism. True to his early tradition, however, Fichte's initial response to the Revolution was that of a typical liberal in politics: at first he protested vehemently against the violation of individual rights by an irresponsible and absolutist revolutionary government, but with its continued success, he began to ignore those excesses, became tolerant, then favorable, and finally enthusiastic in its support. Whereas he had formerly looked upon the state as at least a potential enemy of individual rights, he now came to regard it as the best instrument for the realization of the individual's greatest social welfare.

OUT of the French Revolution emerged Napoleon, and at his hands Prussia with her German allies suffered inglorious defeat at the battle of Jena and Auerstadt. After these conquests Napoleon entered Berlin in triumph and took possession also of most of Prussia. Then it was that, just as the French-dominated Treaty of Versailles degraded a proud and mighty Germany to the status of a third-rate power, Napoleon, in the Treaty of Tilsit, fastened upon Prussia an insufferable military and economic French hegemony.

It was in this political setting that Fichte delivered the famous series of lectures invariably associated with his name: *Reden an die Deutsche Nation*. In these famous fourteen *Addresses to the German Nation* Fichte called to all Germans as a people, denouncing provincial particularism as obsolete and sinful. Excerpting from Dr. Engelbrecht's excellent summary of the first address, and remembering that it is Johann

* *Johann Gottlieb Fichte*. By H. C. Engelbrecht. Columbia University Press. \$3.50.

Fichte and not Adolf Hitler who speaks, we find that the old political system is doomed because

it had been educated in a false philosophy; it was wholly individualistic and selfish. It had a wrong conception of society and the state. Ideals like Humanity, Liberalism, and Popular Rights were dominant, and these had really become synonymous with laziness and a behavior without dignity. Government was weak and ineffective and tried to insure its stability and continuation by leaning on foreign powers. . . . The nation was not living its own life, but was a part of a strange and foreign way of life. All this may be changed by a new education. This new education is not for any special group or class, but for the nation as a whole. "The dawn of a new world has already broken, the mountain tops are already gilded announcing the advent of the new day."

In subsequent lectures Fichte expanded his conception of the new nation which is to be, declaring that only those nations have survived which have loved freedom and hated slavery, have been consumed by a burning love for the fatherland and have been inspired by devotion to eternal truths. "The German spirit is an eagle," he declared, "whose mighty body thrusts itself on high and soars on strong and well-practiced wing into the empyrean. . . . You will see in spirit the German name rising by means of this generation to be the most glorious among all peoples. . . . You of all modern peoples [are] the one in whom the seed of human perfection most unmistakably lies. . . . If you go under, all humanity goes under with you."

BECAUSE the German people were ground down by an ignoble and insufferable political and economic suppression, and yet stimulated constantly by that very suppression to reassert their political and economic independence through their own strength, it was practically inevitable that popular revolt throughout northern and central Germany should flare into concerted military rebellion against the French as authors of their degradation. The army limitation was evaded by introducing a system of military conscription which trained 42,000 new recruits each year, while Germany's internal resources were developed and her administration modernized. Nationalism and militarism surged high; everywhere in Germany a war for liberation was confidently expected and planned. In 1813 it came; Prussia led in a struggle to free all Europe from the domination of Napoleon. After two years the war was over; French hegemony was at last broken and German independence restored.

Twenty-five years later the Fichtean legend began to grow, and so the *Reden* came to take its false place in the history of the development of German nationalism. "Beginning in 1840, and especially through the centenary of 1862, Fichte was treated more and more as a national hero and prophet. Of all his works the *Reden* were chiefly remembered, and these were interpreted in any way that happened to suit the immediate needs of the nationalists. . . . The *Reden* were

seen as a mighty stroke against Napoleon and to them were ascribed a powerful influence on the reforms after 1806. Moreover, the year 1806-07 was seen as the dividing line between cosmopolitanism and patriotism in Fichte's thought. Finally, this interpretation became the accepted one in standard historical writing." Thus did Fichte the misinterpreted patriot come to overshadow completely Fichte the world-affirming idealist.

TODAY the stage of history is being set for a repetition in German national history. Once again a proud and mighty people has been reduced by military conquest and economic defeat to psychological and political desperation, and once again a war of liberation is expected and planned by them. "Our guiding principle," says Hitler, "is that only strength is entitled to claim the right to live; this is never accorded to weakness. From the inception of our movement this has been our burning conviction." Germany must isolate and conquer France, writes the *Führer* in his autobiography, *Mein Kampf*, and not "until this is fully understood in Germany, so that the German nation's will to live is no longer wasted in passive defense, but is gathered together for a final settlement with France, shall we be able to bring the eternal and fruitless struggle with that country to a decision." And while the scenes are being shifted, Nazi Germany is learning well her lines; in the not-distant future she will speak them in action. Even now the opening bars of a Nazi battle-song, "To Arms!" are used to introduce and conclude every official governmental radio broadcast, while the salutation "Heil, Hitler" has already become a deeply entrenched part of the national mores.

For the present critical situation the Allies have themselves to blame. Despite the lesson of history already written in their own national heart's blood, the war-mad victors at Versailles inaugurated policies toward Germany which, when pursued as they were, could lead only to the Hitler terror. Neither then nor now have they understood what is not only an ethical ideal but also the first law of history: that until justice be done there can be no durable peace.

19th Century

Tilsit
Ceded Territories
Indemnity
Occupation of Berlin
Desperate Prussia
War of Liberation

20th Century

Versailles
Corridor and colonies
Reparations
Occupation of the Ruhr
Nazi Germany
?

Could European statesmen look even now with steady eyes at the crimson pages of their own history, they might at last understand that vindictive treaties lead invariably and inevitably to reactive rebellion and so might take whatever steps are still possible to prevent changing that final interrogation into a fearful certainty.

Socialist Gains in Arizona

J. HARVEY TREMAINE

ON Tuesday, October 3, the people of Arizona went to the polls to choose a successor to Lewis W. Douglas for their representative in Congress. Mrs. Isabella Greenway, widow of the late Col. John C. Greenway, millionaire copper magnate and a leading spirit in the famous Bisbee deportations, had entered the race as the choice of the Democrats. Her party's Committeewoman from Arizona, Mrs. Greenway has been for years a personal friend of the Roosevelts; she was, indeed, a bridesmaid at the wedding of Eleanor and Franklin Roosevelt. The Republicans, having failed to select a nominee in the primaries, finally drafted Mr. H. B. Wilkinson, a prominent Phoenix business man.

Despairing liberals and radicals shook their heads dejectedly. Why struggle against such odds? Had not Mrs. Greenway spent \$16,772.46 in the primaries alone, according to her own report to the Secretary of State? Of what avail could arguments for economic justice and a sane social order be in face of such opposition?

Yet one group of recalcitrants refused to be stampeded. The Socialist Party, with no State organization and only two small locals in the communities of Yuma and Winslow, nominated an electrician, Mr. D. E. Sumpter. They did not expect a large vote for their candidate. The Socialist registration in Arizona was negligible, and no funds were available to support an extensive campaign. Mr. H. Sinclair, formerly secretary of the Oklahoma Socialist Party, came to Phoenix from Winslow to make contacts in the interest of his party's candidate. Although he had the names of but two Socialists when he arrived in the capital, he soon uncovered so much Socialist sentiment among farmers, laborers, and business and professional folk that it became clear to him the old political alignments were breaking down. "I was amused," he declared, "to find so many people in all walks of life groping toward the ideal of social ownership and democratic control of industry. There was a keen awareness among farmers and city people that only a party of their own can save them."

Three weeks before election day candidate Sumpter began his speaking tour. Realizing that he could not possibly reach more than a few communities, he came first to Phoenix, metropolis of the famed Salt River Valley, where one-third of the State's voters live. His first appearance in the capital was sponsored by the United Veterans' Political League, his second by the Arizona Producers' and Consumers' League. His can-

didacy was publicly supported by such men as Mr. Marshall Humphrey, Mr. E. W. d'Allemand, Mr. Frank Hilgeman, and Mr. James Sayre, all prominent in the city's industrial, political, and social life. With a few honorable exceptions, the press would not report Mr. Sumpter's views or mention his candidacy. In quick succession, for the time was short, Mr. Sumpter spoke in Mesa, Chandler, Gilbert, Glendale, Tucson, Douglas, Bisbee, and Miami. Hardly anywhere had there been any advance preparation to speak of or adequate publicity.

THE final results showed that Mrs. Greenway had secured 24,163 votes, Mr. Sumpter, 5,556, and Mr. Wilkinson, 3,123. In Maricopa County, with one-third of the State's voting strength, the standing was: Greenway, 7,014; Sumpter, 3,201; Wilkinson, 1,069. The Socialist candidate actually carried four Maricopa precincts and tied for first place in three others. The Maricopa returns are particularly significant, because in this county are to be found people from all sections of the United States. In the past, the county has been considered a conservative stronghold. Practically all of the Socialist campaigning was done there because it is the center of the State's population, and more people can be reached with less money.

The highest Socialist vote ever cast before in Arizona was 3,174, for Allan Benson in 1916. At that time the Party had a State organization. Last year the congressional candidate polled only 1,112. It is interesting to note that Mr. Sumpter avoided "reformism," insisting that capitalism is dying and must be replaced by a new social order. For each vote received Mrs. Greenway spent almost one dollar; Mr. Sumpter, six cents.

What conclusions may we draw from the results of this election? Some salient facts emerge. Certainly the Republican Party has almost collapsed in the Southwest. The New Deal is clearly not as popular as it was last year. There is a definite and easily discernible swing toward the Left, with many people losing their prejudice against socialism and willing to support the Socialist Party. The times are ripe, apparently, for a shift in political alignment. Whether the Socialist Party itself is to lead the way into the Promised Land or is to be absorbed in a new group remains to be seen. It has in any event experienced an amazing revival in Arizona, startling the professional politicians by achieving results which they had considered impossible. The future is in the lap of the gods.

That Fellowship Questionnaire

JOHN BENNETT

THE Fellowship of Reconciliation has sent out to its members a questionnaire on coercion in the class struggle. The aim of this questionnaire is to clear up some of the confusions in a controversy which has torn the Fellowship apart for years. Founded during the War as an expression of pacifist conviction, the Fellowship has entered the industrial struggle in recent years, with the result that many of its members feel the tension between the pacifist philosophy which they hammered out in relation to war and the apparent inevitability of the use of coercion in the struggle for economic justice. The questionnaire sets forth six positions which may be held in relation to coercion in the class struggle. This article is a commentary on those six positions.

There are two presuppositions on which this article is based which I must mention before I proceed to a discussion of the questionnaire. Opinions concerning the specific problems which that document raises will be determined by one's attitude towards these presuppositions.

The first is that no form of pacifism is worthy of consideration which doesn't face the real nature of our economic system, which doesn't see clearly that capitalism is based upon coercion and violence and that it is destructive of human life and human values on a colossal scale. It is easy to be a pacifist in a fool's paradise. Even the pacifism which does face these facts about the present order but which says with some bravado that it would prefer to go down to defeat rather than win economic change by means of violence is under grave suspicion unless it comes from those who pay the real price for the defeat.

The second presupposition is that all the positions which are presented in this questionnaire represent open questions. Not even participation in class war is ruled out in advance by any absolute moral or religious principle. Not that there are no such principles, or that we are doomed to wander in a maze of experimentation without standards or goals. Such a principle as reverence for human life is normative for every situation. Every policy must be judged by it. But I cannot assume in advance that participation in a class war is condemned by it. We are dealing here with a problem in which our surest principles seem to be capable of being heard on both sides of the question, depending on our interpretation of the facts. If we really believe that capitalism is a ruthless system which results in starvation, disease, death, warped

bodies and souls for millions, that it will inevitably bring about another world war with its unlimited violence and destruction, and if we really believe also that it is possible to overthrow that system by quick violent action which would take a small toll of lives compared with the system which it would destroy—if we really believe both of those things, can we be sure that any moral absolute would forbid such revolutionary action? The pacifist may well argue that no such clear issue confronts us, that revolutionary action might be too destructive, that his own way of non-violent persuasion is a better way to end the system. But to argue in that way is to shift the basis of the discussion from rigid adherence to an *a priori* principle to a description of the actual situation and a careful weighing of the consequences of a revolutionary strategy. It is on that second basis that I shall proceed to discuss the referendum which follows:

In seeking for "a social order which will suffer no individual or group to be exploited for the profit or pleasure of another," I believe the members and secretaries of the Fellowship should go so far as to:

1. Proclaim the ideal of such a social order and endeavor through methods of love, moral suasion and education to bring in the new order, but refuse to identify themselves with either the under-privileged class or the privileged class to the virtual exclusion of the other.

2. Identify themselves with the just aims of the workers and under-privileged, and protest against the use the violence by the police, militia and under-privileged groups; raise and distribute relief to workers striking for a living wage; attempt peacefully to maintain the civil liberties of exploited groups and espouse publicly their aims, but without the use of any form of coercion.

3. Assist in organizing the workers into unions and in leading them in strikes for a living wage, and if need be in a non-violent general strike; assist in organizing the workers into a political party which will use non-violent political and economic coercive measures in order to secure the abolition of capitalism, but dissociating themselves from any group that used armed violence to gain its ends.

4. In case the legal owners of the essential industries resort to armed force in an attempt to maintain or to regain control of their property, refuse to use violence against them, but offer to serve the workers as a social worker among their families, as a maintainer of food supplies, as a nurse or stretcher bearer, or in other non-violent ways.

5. In the situation described in No. 4 consent to the use of armed force if necessary to secure the advantage of the workers, but regretfully and only while the necessity for it continues.

6. In anticipation of general class warfare, assist in the arming of workers and in other ways prepare them for the

struggle; when war is fully joined, urge workers to acts of violence and participate with them in such acts.

The first position is ambiguous at a very important point. If it means that we must refuse to separate ourselves from the privileged class as so many human beings and must seek their real welfare as truly as we seek the welfare of any other group, it is obviously sound. Any social strategy which makes love for privileged people impossible, which rides roughshod over their welfare as persons, is immoral. There is no human group, privileged or unprivileged, which we can exclude from the circle within which our moral obligation towards, and our love for, persons is effective.

But if this first position means that we are to try to be neutral in the class struggle, it is clearly an impossible one. The class struggle is not a clash between two or more equally valid sets of interests. If that were so, neutrality would be possible. The aspirations of the workers and farmers are on a different moral basis from the economic interests and legal rights of the privileged. Those aspirations are much closer to an objective justice. Moreover, to attempt to be neutral is in practice to add our weight to the forces of inertia in society. It would be disguised support of the status quo. Since the status quo is largely the congealed injustice of the centuries, there is no escape from the obligation to identify ourselves with the interests of its victims. This does not mean an uncritical acceptance of all their aims or methods or any illusions about their superior virtue.

The fifth and sixth positions can be discarded together on pragmatic grounds. Indeed, of the two the sixth is preferable. If we are going to go on the assumption that in the crisis we are to use armed force, the sooner that we prepare for it the better, both in providing arms and in disciplining people for the war. The apparent moral advantages in the fifth position are quite misleading. Why should it be said that those who take this position do it "regretfully", as though that word would not apply just as fairly to any earnest person who takes the sixth position?

To anticipate general class war and to arm the workers in preparation for it or to go on the assumption that they are to depend on arms when the emergency arrives is to proceed on a hopelessly unreal picture of the American scene. It would be the surest way of defeating the cause of the workers and of throwing over what chance we have to build a good society in America. I can merely outline the reasons for this conclusion:

1. Our class divisions in America are such that it is doubtful if the class-conscious workers will ever be more than a minority of the people. To talk in terms of class war would be to consolidate the rest of the community—the farmers, the middle classes, as well as the most privileged group—in the name of law and order against the workers. The first things which

guns, used even in self-defense, would destroy would be the moral prestige which is attached to the cause of the exploited and the opportunity of the workers to win support from the semi-neutral groups which are of decisive importance in America.

2. The military power of the state, backed by all the resources of the privileged class, would be thrown against the workers. If they rely on guns they are beaten before they begin. The only ways in which they can expect to make headway against the army are to convert the soldiers themselves and to capture the strategic positions in the state by political means. It is hard to imagine the former in the case of a professional army, and if the latter were possible armed revolution would not be necessary.

3. The forces of destruction in a class war could never be controlled in our complex technological society. Whether or not such a war would leave much for the workers to capture is a serious question. It would probably lead to unutterable chaos.

4. A new order built by war would have to be maintained by the methods of war. Unless a large majority were persuaded to consent to a change (in which case war in the first place would be unnecessary) the ruthlessness of the new order would make it unfit for any class to live in.

5. The possibilities of economic change by means of persuasion and the more peaceful methods of coercion have not yet been exhausted in America. It is not possible to combine violence or the talk of violence with persuasion, but persuasion and non-violent coercion are not incompatible. Sometimes such coercion calls the attention of the semi-neutral classes to the injustice from which the workers suffer, as in the case of some strikes. But between violence and persuasion we must choose. To abandon the way of peaceful revolution until it has been fully tried would be a tragic blunder, but to be fully tried it must be fully trusted.

A comparison of the second and third positions will bring out most of the confusions which surround this whole controversy. The chief difference between the two is that in the second position the pacifist is to take no responsibility for the organization of the workers or for the leadership of a strike or even for the formation of a political party which will use methods of political coercion. But the pacifist will give moral support to the aims of the organized workers, and he will help to maintain the workers during the period of a strike.

Before we can be clear about the difference between these two positions we must have an answer to one question. Do those who take the second position believe in the necessity of labor organization, of strikes for a living wage, of political coercion? If they don't, perhaps they can say that they are able to help the workers in the detached way suggested by the second

position without being morally involved in their coercive measures. But if they do believe in the necessity of these things, they must answer a further question. Why do they maintain this detached attitude towards the process of organizing the workers for economic and political forms of non-violent coercion? It is very important that they be clear about their real answer. Is it because of their vocational position, because they are not fitted to take such leadership but are fitted to plead the cause of the workers (including the necessity of their using coercion) to the middle classes? Or is it that they believe that they remain free from responsibility for coercion if they leave to others what they recognize as the necessary "dirty work" of organizing for such coercion and making it successful? I think that the mere statement of those questions indicates how weak is the claim of the pacifist who, admitting the necessity of organization for non-violent coercion, feels that detachment from the actual coercive measures gives him a moral advantage of any kind.

The result of this analysis is that for those who admit the necessity of such non-violent coercion this second position is really self-contradictory, because the words "but without the use of any form of coercion" represent an unreal situation. Also for such persons there is no real difference between the second, third and fourth positions. They all belong together, if confusions are ironed out, and represent the elaboration of one position.

I stress this point because I think that if most of us would see it, a great deal of the present controversy would be undercut. There are too many who take part in the controversy who refuse to admit the logic of their own positions. They admit the necessity of non-violent coercion, as shown by the fact that they believe in labor organization and political action. But when the word "coercion" is used they are shocked. They make the situation worse by using that word and all other words and phrases in this area without discrimination. Half the time they talk as though "coercion" and "violence" were synonymous. Half the time they confuse "class war" with "class struggle." In an analytical mood they know the differences between these words, but the emotional overtones of the words are not touched by the analysis, and so they continue to cause endless confusion. The confusion reaches its climax when men (not in the Fellowship) combine with this horror of coercion the belief that armed force against another nation is sometimes justified.

These three middle positions taken together form a very sound position. There is, however, one problem to which none of them does justice: the problem of incidental violence. It is quite obvious in the American situation that we cannot expect to have a serious strike on the part of workers or farmers without ac-

companying violence. The violence may come first from owners, from the state or from strikers. This fact means that while we can speak of non-violent coercion as representing the main strategy with which we identify ourselves in this position, we must face the fact that we cannot support such forms of non-violent coercion without creating a situation which will make incidental violence inevitable. Even Gandhi, as has often been pointed out, could not escape this difficulty. So serious is this problem that we would do well to add to the distinction between violent and non-violent coercion the distinction between planned and incidental violence on the part of the workers. It is impossible for the pacifist to go as far as this middle position without being implicated in the incidental violence which attends the struggle for social change as well as in the violence upon which capitalism is based at all times. He might as well admit that he cannot keep his soul unspotted from the world of violence. The most that he can do if he is to plan an effective part in the struggle for justice, is to stand firmly against the self-destructive folly of all violence, planned and incidental, knowing as he does so that he has himself helped to let loose forces which make a minimum of incidental violence inevitable.

A discussion of coercion throws things out of balance unless one keeps in mind continually the relation between coercion and the forces of persuasion. This questionnaire doesn't offer much chance to suggest the relative emphasis which we should place upon coercion and persuasion. Much of the controversy over coercion is rooted in different emphases rather than in different principles. One of the few fair reviews of *Moral Man and Immoral Society* which I have read, that by J. H. Muirhead in the *Hibbert Journal*, called attention to the fact that a slight change of emphasis would have made that volume one to inspire hope rather than pessimism concerning the possibility of peaceful change. No matter what position we take about coercion, we all believe, when we think in terms of total strategy, that unless the majority of the middle-class people are persuaded to consent to social change, the new order can only be given stability by a ruthlessness which will poison it. In the task of persuading the great mass of people of the justice and the economic necessity of radical economic change we could all coöperate more effectively than we do in spite of differences about coercion. There is no greater obstacle to peaceful revolution than that cocksure Marxism which deals with classes and the state as though they were social entities the character of which is simple and definitely known. Peaceful revolution will only be possible if whenever we assert the necessity of coercion we also assert that we cannot set definite limits to the power of moral forces in history.

Untangling Europe

The Intelligent Man's Review of Europe Today. By G. D. H. Cole and Margaret Cole. Alfred A. Knopf. \$3.00.

THOSE who have come to look to G. D. H. Cole to furnish the most penetrating and lucid interpretation of each year's events will not be disappointed in his most recent book. Writing in collaboration with his wife, Mr. Cole has transferred his great talent for simplicity and clarity from his accustomed field of economics to that of politics without loss of conviction. So successful is he, in fact, that the book may be set down as a landmark in popular education.

The Intelligent Man's Review of Europe Today begins where most college textbooks end—with the close of the European War. The first of its three main sections sketches the geographic and economic setting of each country in Europe, and summarizes briefly their political developments during the post-war period. Especially rewarding are the chapters devoted to the countries which have suffered violent political upheavals—Russia, Italy, Spain and Germany. The second section finds Mr. Cole at his best, in an analysis of the present economic disorders in Europe, with special reference to agriculture and the monetary crisis. The last portion of the book is devoted to consideration of Europe's conflicting political forces—democracy, socialism, fascism and communism—and of the various attempts which have been made at international organization.

As Socialists of long standing, the Coles are especially critical of European socialism as they find it manifested in most countries. The Social-Democrats of Germany are charged with engineering their own downfall by their timidity and their policies of class-collaboration, while the British Labour Party is similarly accused of stage-fright at the prospect of assuming power. Only in Spain do the authors find the Socialists justified in seeking a coalition with the bourgeois parties. Yet while we are repeatedly told that the one hope of solving present-day difficulties lies in the adoption of a thoroughgoing socialism, the distinction between the brand of socialism advocated by the Coles and the "gradualism" which they denounce is by no means as clear as one might have reason to expect.

More satisfactory is the emphasis throughout the book on internationalism, which is particularly refreshing in these days when the prevailing trend of opinion, even in high places, appears to be toward "autarchy." While the authors do not deny that capitalism still has a certain degree of vitality, they see its continued existence dependent upon the possibility of working out a new technique of international coöperation. Under present conditions of international competition, they declare, "no one capitalist country can . . . easily advance its working-class standards far beyond the others, either by raising wages and so directly adding to the cost of production, or by improving social services." This problem is greatly accentuated by the rise of fascism in Germany, for if Italy may be taken as a criterion, fascist countries are not adverse to the sacrificing of living standards, by appeals to patriotism, in order to improve their competitive position in the world markets. Thus nationalism is seen as the implacable enemy of capitalism as well as of socialism: of the former because it prevents the fullest use of the world's productive capacity, and of the latter because it reinforces and sanctions monopolistic property rights. The study of the Europe of today does not, unfortunately, give one much confidence that the fires of nationalism can be quenched in time to avert catastrophe.

MAXWELL S. STEWART

Two Modern Apostles Speak

Christ in the Silence. By C. F. Andrews. The Abingdon Press. \$1.50.

Christ and Human Suffering. By E. Stanley Jones. The Abingdon Press. \$1.00.

ONE of the world's outstanding Christians takes as his theme: "Let us keep our silent sanctuaries: for in them the eternal perspectives are preserved," and writes simply and intimately of his personal experience of the living Christ, his constant Companion, his Lord and Master. Mr. Andrews' faith is that of first-century Christians. It is a faith which has produced a life of impelling beauty and power, a life which has not remained cloistered but has gone forth into bitter racial and political struggle. One sees little of first-century faith today. Many of those who hold it intellectually are apt to possess too frail a devotion to make it convincing. For others, faith in the person of Christ has been dissolved by criticism. One may not interpret the Fourth Gospel, as does Mr. Andrews, or understand his completely Christo-centric experience, but one is moved by the life that is set forth here, life that is illumined with peace and quickening power, grounded in the eternities of God; not withdrawn from the world, but living intensely in its present agony and chaos.

It is a truism to speak of the need in this age of turmoil of laying hold of the eternal perspectives. Mr. Andrews reminds us how few of us, even those most actively engaged in social reconstruction, have capacity for the insights that belong to the ages. At this moment in history, with violence on every side and the threat of overwhelming catastrophe ahead, we are so keenly aware of the frailties of human nature and the relativities of history that we may tend to lose sight of and faith in the absolute. Mr. Andrews' words about love and its demands offer food for long reflection. His words about the need for solitude and meditation, the resources of prayer and, most especially, his insistence that prayer without love avails nothing cause one again to count the cost of the Good Life and to repent of life lived in the shallows when it might be lived in the deeps. Throughout the book one is again and again reminded of how minute is the sacrifice and feeble the devotion one is willing to render to God.

Mr. Jones deals with the age-long problem of suffering, the suffering that is forever with the human soul and the suffering arising from the chaos of a period of transition such as the present. The theme is centered on the truth that the only way through tragedy is facing it, and using it for higher ends. "Active dealing with sorrow puts a new dimension to life." Again and again Mr. Jones insists that there is no easy way out, that subterfuge, dodging, refusing to meet the final issue is fatal. Pain is necessary to the growth of character. The book is filled with illustrations of men and women who have met dire disaster using it to transform their lives and life about them, "snatching out of the heart of calamity a victory of spirit." One may not agree with Mr. Jones' interpretation of Jesus or believe with such complete assurance that "the Kingdom of God will ultimately triumph, banishing all sin, suffering and death," but one knows that a profound truth is set forth in these pages. Tragedy need not blight and utterly destroy life. If one can but have the courage to face it, and have faith in the resources of Eternal Goodness, Life can transcend life, and tragedy be used for the creation of the Good. Doubtless there are countless men and women today who stand in desperate need of such a philosophy and faith as that set forth by Mr. Jones.

FRANCES PERRY

CORRESPONDENCE

Judge Panken Replies

J. B. MATTHEWS, the secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, would find it difficult to reconcile what he said in his article in *THE WORLD TOMORROW* of November 23, 1933, with the truth as to what my position is and what I said at the Conference of the Labor and Socialist International.

In his article Mr. Matthews wrote:

Ignoring the fact that the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party in the United States had chosen a delegation on which he was outvoted two to one, Jacob Panken declared on the floor of the Congress that he believed his opinions were shared by the great majority of American Socialists. This was a charge that the American Party had sent an unrepresentative delegation.

I believe my opinions are shared by a vast majority of American Socialists. That, however, was not said by me at the conference. The official transcript of what I said there should be conclusive. The record is as follows:

I rise to speak in accord with the call of the conference and to express my own personal opinion and, I believe, to give voice to the opinion of a large section of the Socialist Party in America.

It is quite evident that Mr. Matthews, in having me say the things that I did not say, intended to create an impression that the position taken by the other delegates to the conference is shared by a majority of American Socialists. That, I believe, is not the fact. The Matthews' article is of the insinuating type of propaganda. It is unfair. J. B. Matthews did not attend the conference. He evidently depended upon information given to him privately, or possibly on what his co-author, the "observer," relayed to him. Whichever is the fact, the statement attributed to me is false.

In the same article Mr. Matthews makes it appear that I emphasized the advantages of codes and the abolition of child labor as a result of the NRA to give the impression that I committed myself as favoring the NRA.

On that score also let the record speak. The official transcript of my address in part reads as follows:

There has been a great deal of misconception in some quarters abroad, and even in my own country, about the purpose and intent of the National Industrial Recovery Act. I have heard here, and even from some in the United States, assumptions of this kind: that our President, Mr. Roosevelt, is bringing in socialism without the aid of Socialists. I think, therefore, that we ought to have a clear idea as to what this National Industrial Recovery Act is. . . . I think it is pertinent that this conference should know what it is, how it works, and what is to be expected from it. The purpose of the National Industrial Recovery Act was to spread work, to create greater purchasing power. The Act intends to fix prices of commodities. . . . The Act also puts a tremendous weapon into the hands of the President. . . . I am inclined to believe that so far as the spread of work is concerned, there will be some little done, but so far as the creation of greater purchasing power is concerned, I think the Act is going to fail. As a matter of fact, even before the Act became operative, before any code was submitted, before any minimum wages or maximum hours were provided for, the price levels of commodities had increased to such an extent that the increase in the price levels had utterly and completely liquidated any possible increase in wages. But there are gains that we may derive from the Act. For instance, codes which have been approved by the President provide

that no child under 16 years of age shall be permitted to work in industry. That is a tremendous gain. In some industries, the age limit has been placed at 18 years. But there is an even more important gain as a by-product of this Act. Our Trade Union Movement in America has, from its inception, been organized along craft lines: there was no industrial form of organization in the United States of any size, and the American Federation of Labor was committed to craft organization, but by reason of the Act it has become necessary that the working class shall be organized on an industrial basis because the codes are fixed not for trades, but for industry. And the President of the American Federation of Labor announced to the country not long ago that an attempt will be made to organize the workers in various parts of the country on industrial lines. . . . That is a distinct gain. It will make for more efficient economic action by Labor.

Then, later on in my address, I said, apropos of the NRA:

In other words, American Labor is face to face with the class struggle, and I think that will help the development of a class-conscious spirit. Much more, it will help to develop a political consciousness of working class needs in the United States.

There is no doubt that Labor can make use of the NRA to some advantage. It has, in some instances, done so already. Many hundreds of thousands of workers have been organized. Strikes were called which bore a political character. Any strike of workmen against a code must, of necessity, be political in its nature. The limitation of child labor is an advantage to the workers.

One must be a realist, one must be truthful. That's one phase of it. Aside from that, whatever can be used by Labor as a weapon in the advancement of its interests must be used. The Recovery Administration cannot be disregarded. Labor must make use of that Recovery Administration for its own ends and purposes. The struggle is carried on by the workers on every battle front. The clash of class interests before the Recovery Administration is so pronounced that not even the most conservative of trade-unionists can fail to see it. Every advantage obtained by the workers gives them confidence in their power as a class. It's awfully nice to sit somewhere behind a desk and theorize, but that brings you nowhere. That is not participating in the struggle.

I am moved to write these few notes because the one thing that you should avoid, even though there may be differences of opinion, is misstatement. I gave from my address just a few excerpts: those that point out what advantages Labor may exact for itself from the NRA and my opinion of the NRA and its ultimate failure.

I know that there has been a good deal of misrepresentation of my position and the position of others in the Socialist movement, not only with relation to the NRA, but on questions such as the use of democracy as a weapon, the United Front, and many other problems now confronting us. Such misrepresentation is more than unfair: it is unfortunate for the cause, if not downright disloyal.

JACOB PANKEN

New York, N. Y.

Concerning the F. O. R.

AS a member of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, serving on its Executive Committee, I am deeply concerned in having its purposes continue along the broad lines under which it has worked for many years. There has been a divergence of opinion as to whether the Fellowship should have an absolute pacifist position in industrial as well as in international struggles.

As many of the readers of *THE WORLD TOMORROW* are also members of the Fellowship, I am grateful for the privilege of emphasizing in its columns my conviction on the necessity of including in our organization not only those who desire to work for non-violence just as far as it is possible, but also those others who, under exceptional circumstances, may feel it their duty to stand with workers who are forced to use more violent methods against their exploiters.

We must remember that while our Statement of Purpose declares that: "Although members do not bind themselves to any exact form of words, they refuse to participate in any war, or to sanction military preparations; they work to abolish war and to foster good will among nations, races and classes"—it goes on to affirm that the members "... seek to avoid bitterness and contention, and to maintain the spirit of self-giving love while engaged in the struggle to achieve these purposes." It seems to me that this leaves it open to members and secretaries to work, if necessary, with coercive means in the class struggle. I deplore our being forced in the questionnaire to state to what exact degree a secretary of the Fellowship may go. To me this savors of heresy-hunting, especially coming from a Fellowship that tries to dispel antagonisms in a spirit of love.

I cannot but wonder whether fundamentally the difference of opinion in the Fellowship is founded entirely on the absolute pacifist position of some of its members, or on their fear, possibly held unconsciously, that the Fellowship may become too aggressively opposed to capitalism.

Personally, I hope that the result of the answers to the referendum may prove that the Fellowship can go on as it has for years, giving leeway to all its secretaries to work conscientiously "to build a social order which will suffer no individual or group to be exploited for the profit or pleasure of another." We should remember that this last statement is quite as binding on the membership as that of non-participation in any war. How the objects of the Fellowship may best be furthered rests upon the individual conscience of its members as long as they are carried on in the spirit of the Fellowship.

Baltimore, Md.

ELISABETH GILMAN

(NOTE: The questionnaire to which Miss Gilman refers is quoted in part in the body of John Bennett's article in this issue.—*The Editors*)

Caribbean Seminar

MAY we, through your columns, draw the attention of your readers to the third annual Seminar in the Caribbean, to be held in Cuba, March 7-14, 1934, under the auspices of The Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America? We believe, especially in view of recent developments, that it is of increasing importance that Americans should have insight into the problems, culture, and lives of the Cuban people.

The Seminar will begin with lectures on shipboard en route from New York to Havana. The program in Cuba will include lectures, round table discussions, and field trips into the interior. The faculty of the Seminar, leading its discussions and perfecting its contacts with Cuba and Cubans, will include Dr. Ernest Gruening, Miss Elizabeth Wallace, Dr. Chester Lloyd Jones, and Mr. Hubert C. Herring.

Applications and requests for detailed information should be addressed to Mr. Hubert C. Herring, Executive Director, The Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America, 112 East 19th Street, New York, N. Y.

New York, N. Y.

HUBERT C. HERRING



AFTER all, I have done a great deal of public speaking in my time; and it cannot be denied that I have equipped myself to write as an expert on the art of ruining a public meeting. Hence I propose herein to set forth a few simple rules by which an audience may be sent away feeling that the cause expounded is loony and the group sponsoring it worthy of anyone's profound hostility. This will be helpful to the many Socialist locals and radical organizations which may, possibly, have even now something to learn along this line.

First, consider the hall. Select a hall, if one can be conveniently located, over a noisy saloon or on a remote side street. This is of some importance, for a hall of this kind will, if properly advertised throughout the community, do the whole job in the very beginning, and ruin the occasion without the expense of any further efforts—by far the most economical manner of wrecking a meeting.

Second, it is highly essential that the hall be kept cold for several days previous to the meeting, and that on the night of the gathering someone bribe the janitor to let the fire go out. Thus, when the crowd gathers to hear the speaker, they will be all a-tremble for his message.

A third step is a careful survey of all those efforts which may be reasonably carried out to make the hall as unattractive and barren as possible. A few cigarette stubs judiciously strewed around the corners will convey their own atmosphere; bits of paper lying carelessly under seats will supply the proper *je ne sais quoi* without which no meeting can be a total failure. Do not have gay curtains, colorful banners, fresh paint, attractive posters, or anything which might serve to distract the mind of the audience from the sheer ineptitude of those in charge. Certainly have no music, vocal or instrumental; it has too much appeal.

It is prudent, too, in all public announcements of the meeting, to have your printers insert a few skillfully misspelled words. This carries the aroma of true democracy, which is heightened by the use of bad grammar on the programs and tickets. These also, by the way, ought to be smudgy and poorly printed, and, if possible, well thumb-marked, presumably to indicate the interest of the law in tracking down the possessors of them.

Whatever you do, be modest about your speaker and your entire enterprise. Do not allow people to guess that the speaker is anybody in particular; that would only be putting men ahead of principles. Just state the poor sap's job, if you happen to know it, slap a poster up on a few walls, and let it go at that. People like guessing about a speaker, and, besides, they will be less likely to come to hear him, and this in its own turn makes the job of sweeping up the hall infinitely less wearisome on the morning after.

BUT most important of all, perhaps, is the chairman himself.

For if you have done everything faithfully that might be expected to keep people away, and they still insist on coming, you've simply got to have a chairman. It will be clever to obtain the services of an outspoken man who, in his first sentence, will abuse those who came because of the many who stayed away. He will, if he is a good loser—and many radicals, whatever else, are excellent losers, which is no wonder because of their long practice and their certain future—outline the reasons why his movement is so weak, expressing anger that more people aren't as indefatigable in doing things badly as he is.

Then, of course, as soon as the speaker has finished the job, the way is clear for the post-mortem session of the local executive committee, which will be able to declare, in view of the deficit and the empty seats, that as meetings go, this one was even better than usual. Doubtless the local comrades will declare, stoutly, "Why it was a grand meeting! Hundreds of people were turned away. . . ."

Eccentricus



IN THE TRUE SPIRIT OF CHRISTMAS

Stir Your Friends to Action by Sending Them

The World Tomorrow



FOR \$5 YOU MAY SEND 3 CHRISTMAS GIFTS:

(payable, if necessary, in three monthly payments)

2 annual subscriptions to The World Tomorrow for designated individuals, libraries, or institutions.
1 book selected from the 10 volumes listed below.

AND ENJOY the satisfaction of helping to sustain a publication whose message has never been so urgently needed as during these days of crisis.

TAKE YOUR CHOICE OF THESE VOLUMES

1. **DEMOCRACY IN CRISIS**, by Harold Laski. A brilliant diagnosis of western civilization by one of the most penetrating British minds.
2. **INDIVIDUALISM AND SOCIALISM**, by Kirby Page. Packed with 367 pages of factual data and proposed solutions. Contains a 14-point program of action, a Socialist critique of Communist strategy, and a long section on religion and socialism.
3. **AS I SEE IT**, by Norman Thomas. The author sets out, in burning words, his Socialist ideal—"social salvation without catastrophe, and with a minimum of confusion and disorder, seeking to preserve international peace and to utilize democratic methods."
4. **MORAL MAN AND IMMORAL SOCIETY**, by Reinhold Niebuhr. Man as an individual, says Dr. Niebuhr, is generally idealistic—a moral character—but collectively mankind is immoral. People will not want to believe the ideas presented in this book. Nobody ever wants to believe it is necessary to have an operation.
5. **PREACHERS PRESENT ARMS**, by Ray H. Abrams. An appalling record of chauvinism and militarism by American clergymen during the World War. Names and places are given.
6. **GUIDE TO MODERN THOUGHT**, by C. E. M. Joad. The latest thought on fundamental questions of life: psychology, physics, biology, evolution, astronomy, physical research, etc. Covers the field with brilliant clarity.
7. **THE FIGHT FOR PEACE**, by Devere Allen. A work of 740 pages, covering the history of the organized peace movement since its origin in the United States over a century ago. The story, in detail, of arbitration's growth since the days of ancient Greece.
8. **LIVING CREATIVELY**, by Kirby Page. An effort to combine religion and radicalism. In the first section ten steps toward creative living are set forth, and in the last part devotional readings for 100 days are assembled.
9. **PACIFISM IN THE MODERN WORLD**, edited by Devere Allen. It is impossible to dismiss as a vague and fruitless idealism the way of life which figured so conspicuously in the teachings of Jesus, Buddha, and Lao-Tse; which inspired the early Christians and many later non-violent groups; and which in more recent times has found expression through Tolstoy, Einstein, Rolland, and Gandhi.
10. **THE FOUNTAIN**, by Charles Morgan. Chosen by the Book of the Month Club as "a rich book, admirably written, the fruit evidently of deep experience, and a credit to the English fiction of our time."

THE WORLD TOMORROW

52 Vanderbilt Avenue
New York, N. Y.

I desire to coöperate in the way suggested, and

☐ enclose \$5.00

☐ enclose \$

, and will send the balance in two monthly payments. I enclose herewith the names and addresses of the persons who are to receive the annual subscriptions, and also the title of the book selected and the name and address to which it is to be sent.

Name _____

Street and Number _____

City and State _____



Date Due

DEC 1 1967		
FEB 9 1968		
FEB 11 '72		
MAR 24 '72		
DEC 1 '72		
APR 6 '76		
93	PRINTED	IN U. S. A.